



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

BRENT A CAPEHART, PLC  
7173 ORCHARD POINT ROAD  
HARRISON, AR 72601

**MAILED**

**JUL 01 2011**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Patent No. 6,962,124	:	
Issue Date: November 8, 2005	:	
Application No. 10/780,388	:	DECISION ON PETITION
Filed: February 17, 2004	:	UNDER 37 CFR 1.378(b)
Attorney Docket No. LIL358.0001	:	

This is a decision in response to a communication filed June 6, 2011, transmitting a copy of a petition under 37 CFR 1.378(b), filed August 20, 2010, to accept an unavoidably delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-identified patent. The original petition cannot be located; however, U. S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) finance records confirm receipt of \$1,190 on August 20, 2010. Accordingly, it is conceded that a petition was filed on August 20, 2010, including a \$490 maintenance fee and \$700 surcharge, and subsequently lost in the USPTO.

The present communication is not signed by a registered patent attorney or agent of record. However, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.34, the signature of Robert E. Massa appearing on the correspondence shall constitute a representation to the United States Patent and Trademark Office that he is authorized to represent the particular party on whose behalf he acts. If Mr. Massa desires to receive correspondence regarding this patent, then the appropriate power of attorney documents must be submitted. A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address noted on the petition; however, all future correspondence regarding this patent will be directed solely to the above-noted correspondence address of record.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

If reconsideration of this decision is desired, a petition for reconsideration under 37 CFR 1.378(e) must be filed within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. No extension of this 2-month time limit can be granted under 37 CFR 1.136(a) or (b). **Any such petition for reconsideration must be accompanied by the petition fee of \$400 as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(f).** The petition for reconsideration should include an exhaustive attempt to provide the lacking item(s) noted below, since, after a decision on the petition for reconsideration, no further reconsideration or review of the matter will be undertaken by the Director.

The patent issued November 8, 2005. The first maintenance fee could have been paid from November 8, 2008, through May 8, 2009, or with a surcharge during the period from May 9, 2006 through November 8, 2009. Accordingly, the patent expired at midnight November 8, 2009, for failure to timely submit the first maintenance fee.

A petition to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee under 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b) must be accompanied by (1) an adequate showing that the delay was unavoidable, since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent, (2) payment of the appropriate maintenance fee, unless previously submitted, and (3) payment of the surcharge set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(i)(1).

The petition lacks item (1) above.

The Director may accept late payment of the maintenance fee if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been "unavoidable". 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1).

Petitioner states that the delay in payment of the maintenance fees was unavoidable because "Legal Representation failed to notify company, Lilipad Marine, of Maintenance Fee Notices or Reminders."

Unfortunately, applicant is bound by the consequences of the actions or inactions of his duly authorized and voluntarily chosen representative. Link v. Wabash, 370 U.S. 626, 633-34 (1962); Houston v. Ladner, 973 F.2d 1564, 1567, 23 USPQ2d 1910, 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1992); see also Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (D.N. Ind. 1987).

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3). Petitioner should note that a delay resulting from the lack of knowledge of the need to pay maintenance fees does not excuse the delay. See Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1988), *aff'd*, Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F. Supp. 900, 16 USPQ2d 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), *aff'd*, 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991)(table), *cert. denied*, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992).

Acceptance of late payment of a maintenance fee is considered under the same standard as that for reviving an abandoned application under 35 U.S.C. § 133 because 35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) uses the identical language, i.e. "unavoidable delay". Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 608-09, 34 USPQ2d 1786, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1995)(quoting In re Patent No. 4,409,763, 7 USPQ2d 1798, 1800 (Comm'r Pat. 1988)). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the "reasonably prudent person" standard in determining if the delay in responding to an Office action was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887)(the term "unavoidable" "is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence

than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business"); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-515 (D.C. Cir. 1912); and Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141. In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

In essence, petitioner must show that patentee was aware of the need to pay the maintenance fee, and to that end was tracking it, or had engaged someone to track it before the expiration, but when the fee came due, was "unavoidably" prevented from making the maintenance fee payment until the petition was filed.

In determining whether a delay in paying a maintenance fee was unavoidable, one looks to whether the party responsible for payment of the maintenance fee exercised the due care of a reasonably prudent person. Ray, 55 F.3d at 608-609, 34 USPQ2d at 1787. It is incumbent upon the patent owner to implement steps to schedule and pay the fee, or obligate another to do so. See California Medical Products v. Technol. Med. Prod., 921 F.Supp 1219, 1259 (D. Del. 1995). That is, 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps in place to pay the maintenance fee, and the record currently lacks a showing that any steps were in place by petitioner or anyone else.

The record fails to disclose that the patentee took reasonable steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. In fact, the record indicates that no steps were taken by patentee to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee. Since no steps were taken by patentee, 37 CFR 1.378(b) precludes acceptance of the delayed payment of the maintenance fee. In the absence of a showing that petitioner or anyone else was engaged in tracking the maintenance fee due dates, and that party had in fact been tracking the due dates with a reliable tracking system, such as would be used by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business, petitioner cannot reasonably show that the delay was unavoidable delay. In re Katrapat, 6 USPQ2d 1863, 1867-1868 (Comm'r Pat. 1988); California, supra.

35 U.S.C. § 41(c)(1) does not require an affirmative finding that the delay was avoidable, but only an explanation as to why the petitioner has failed to carry his or her burden to establish that the delay was unavoidable. See Commissariat A. L'Energie Atomique v. Watson, 274 F.2d 594, 597, 124 USPQ 126, 128 (D.C. Cir. 1960)(35 U.S.C. § 133 does not require the Director to affirmatively find that the delay was avoidable, but only to explain why the applicant's petition was unavailing). Petitioner is reminded that it is the patentee's burden under the statutes and regulations to make a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in payment of a maintenance fee is unavoidable. See Rydeen v. Quigg, 748 F. Supp. 900, 16 USPQ2d 1876 (D.D.C. 1990), aff'd 937 F.2d 623 (Fed. Cir. 1991)(table), cert. denied, 502 U.S. 1075 (1992); Ray v. Lehman, supra.

As 35 USC § 41(b) requires the payment of fees at specified intervals to maintain a patent in force, rather than some response to a specific action by the Office under 35 USC § 133, a reasonably prudent person in the exercise of due care and diligence would have taken steps to ensure the timely payment of such maintenance fees. Ray, 55 F.3d at 609, 34 USPQ2d at 1788. That is, an adequate showing that the delay in payment of the maintenance fee at issue was "unavoidable" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps taken by the responsible party to ensure the timely payment of the first maintenance fee for this patent. Id.

As the patentee at the time of expiration, it was incumbent on petitioner to have this patent docketed for payment of the maintenance fee in a reliable system as would be employed by a prudent and careful person with respect to his most important business, or to have engaged another for that purpose. See California Medical Products v. Technol Med. Prod., 921 F.Supp. 1219, 1259 (D.Del. 1995). Even where, as here, another has been relied upon to pay the maintenance fees, such asserted reliance *per se* does not provide a petitioner with a showing of unavoidable delay within the meaning of 37 CFR § 1.378(b) and 35 USC § 41(c). Id. Rather, such reliance merely shifts the focus of the inquiry from the petitioner to whether the obligated party acted reasonably and prudently. Id. Nevertheless, a petitioner is bound by any errors that may have been committed by the obligated party. Id.

First, petitioner has not shown, with supporting documentation, that his agent had taken any steps to enter the instant patent into a tracking system, much less that the system, if any, by his agent was such as would be employed by a prudent and careful person with respect to his most important business. That is, there is as of yet no adequate showing that any steps had been taken with respect to scheduling and paying the maintenance fee by petitioner's father. It is pointed out that 37 CFR 1.378(b) is a validly promulgated regulation, which requires a showing of the steps in place by to pay the fee. Here, there is no corroborative documentation to show that this patent had been docketed in a system or that shows the diligent efforts by petitioner's agent. In the absence of a showing that any steps had been taken, then 37 CFR 1.378(b) precludes acceptance of the payment. In other words, if no steps were taken by petitioner's agent, then any other circumstance would be immaterial to the delay.

Second, petitioner has not shown that petitioner was "unavoidably" prevented from acting in this matter from November 8, 2008, until the petition was filed June 6, 2011. There is no "sliding scale" based upon the priority given to maintaining this patent in force, or more diligently seeking reinstatement, *vis-a-vis* other matters; the issue is solely whether the maintenance, or reinstatement, of the patent at issue was actually conducted with the care or diligence that is generally used and observed by prudent and careful persons in relation to their most important business.

Petitioner should note that if this petition is not renewed or if renewed and not granted, then the maintenance fee and post expiration surcharge are refundable. See 37 CFR

1.378(e) and such may be obtained by written request. Any request for refund must include a copy of this decision and be mailed to Mail Stop 16, Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or faxed to the Customer Service Help Desk at (571) 273-6500.

Petitioner may wish to pursue reinstatement of the patent under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.378(c). Petitioner is advised, however, that any petition under 37 CFR 1.378(c) must be filed on or before November 8, 2011 to be considered timely. Further, a petition to accept the unintentionally delayed payment of a maintenance fee under 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and 37 CFR 1.378(c) must be accompanied by: (1) a statement that the delay was unintentional; (2) payment of the appropriate maintenance fee, unless previously submitted; and (3) payment of the surcharge set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(i)(2).

Petitioner is reminded that the mere suggestion to file a petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.378(c) does not necessarily mean the petition will be granted, since all the requirements under 37 CFR 1.37(b) must be satisfied.

Lastly, patentee is reminded that in accordance with 37 CFR 1.378(d), any petition under 37 CFR 1.378 must be signed by an attorney or agent registered to practice before the Patent and Trademark Office, or by the patentee (all the joint inventors, unless the signing inventor has been given a power of attorney to act on behalf of the other inventors) or an assignee of the entire interest who has complied with the provisions of 37 CFR 3.73(b)<sup>1</sup>, or other party in interest. It is noted that the original petition was improperly signed by one of the three joint inventors.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be delivered through one of the following mediums:

By mail:                      Mail Stop PETITIONS  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    Post Office Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                     Customer Service Window  
                                    Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314

---

<sup>1</sup>37 CFR 3.73(b) provides that: (1) when an assignee seeks to take action in a matter before the Office, the assignee must establish its ownership of the property to the satisfaction of the Commissioner; (2) ownership is established by submitting to the Office, in the Office file related to the matter in which action is sought to be taken, documentary evidence of a chain of title from the original owner to the assignee (e.g., copy of an executed assignment submitted for recording) or by specifying (e.g., reel and frame number) where such evidence is recorded in the Office; (3) the submission establishing ownership must be signed by a party authorized to act on behalf of the assignee; and (4) documents submitted to establish ownership may be required to be recorded as a condition to permitting the assignee to take action in a matter pending before the Office.

By fax: (571) 273-8300  
ATTN: Office of Petitions

By internet: EFS-Web<sup>2</sup>

Any questions concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3204.

/SDB/

Sherry D. Brinkley  
Petitions Examiner  
Office of Petitions

cc: MARK CHILDRESS  
32558 E. 241 ST. SOUTH  
PORTER, OK 74454

---

<sup>2</sup> [www.uspto.gov/ebs/efs\\_help.html](http://www.uspto.gov/ebs/efs_help.html) (for help using EFS-Web call the Patent Electronic Business Center at (866) 217-9197)